DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 127 SP 033 556

AUTHOR Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M.
TITLE Memory and Ideals in French Classrooms.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 59p.; Paper presnted at a Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (November 16, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Authoritarianism; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Research; Comparative Education; Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Context; Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; Ethnography; Foreign Countries; Grade 1; Nonauthoritarian Classes; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Background; Primary Education; Reminiscence; Student Behavior; *Student Participation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Styles; Traditionalism
IDENTIFIERS *France; *Idealization; United States

ABSTRACT

French elementary school teachers as well as the parents of their pupils remember being quiet students in teacher-dominated classrooms. Yet today both teachers and parents idealize lively classroom participation by their pupils or children. In this study, teachers and parents in an urban school district in Villefleurie, France, watched videotaped incidents from French and American classrooms, and their reactions to the tapes were compared. Data were gathered by having viewers respond privately to an open-ended questionnaire before joining in group discussion of the event. Similarities and differences between the teachers' reactions and those of the parents demonstrate the ways in which the French teachers claim to discount traditions from their childhood memories while balancing their modern ideals with a realism gained from on-the-job experience. Three tables provide descriptions of the videotaped event and of children's and teacher's behavior. A sample page from questionnaires in French and in English and transcripts of videotaped episodes from the French classroom are appended. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347127

Memory and Ideals in French Classrooms

Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt
University of Michigan-Dearborn
presented at the American Anthropological Association
November 16, 1989

ABSTRACT. French elementary teachers as well as the parents of their pupils remember their own childhoods as quiet pupils in teacher-dominated classrooms (cf. Wylie, 1974). Yet today both teachers and parents idealize lively classroom participation by their pupils/children. In this study, teachers and parents in an urban school district in France watched videotaped incidents from French and American classrooms, and their reactions to the tapes were compared. Similarities and differences between the teachers' reactions and the parents' demonstrate the ways in which the French teachers claim to discount traditions from their childhood memories while balancing their "modern" ideals with a "realism" gained from on-the-job experience.

SP033 556

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K.M. Anderson-Levitt
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Teacher:	No!	Maitresse:	Beh non!
Student:	(Says something)	Eleve:	(Dit quelque chose)
T:	You are going to confuse the meaning of the words. You know where you find a sail, but you don't know what it is. Do any of your parents have boats?	M:	Non! Tu vas mélanger les mots. Tu sais où on trouve un foc mais tu ne sais pas ce que c'est . Est-ce qu'il y a des parents qui ont des bateaux?
Student:	No	Eleve:	Non.
T:	Or has anyone gone sailing?	M:	Ou qui a déjà fait du bateau?
Student:	Me...	Eleve:	Moi...
T:	Good. So then, you have heard of a sail?	M:	Bon. Alors, est-ce que vous avez déjà entendu parler d'un foc?
Student:	No.	Eleve:	Non.
T:	What are boats like? (Finally tells them that it's on a sailboat).	M:	Comment sont-ils les bateaux?

etc.

Memory and Ideals in French Classrooms[1]

Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt

Introduction

In this paper I will comment on ways in which teachers' thinking may be influenced by childhood memories, "modern" ideals, and on-the-job experience. The focus here is on a very particular bit of thinking, namely, the belief that children ought to "participate," that is, to express themselves, get involved, show an interest in classroom lessons. Let me begin by contrasting some childhood memories with this "modern" ideal.

Memories

The setting for this study is Villefleurie, a medium-sized provincial city in France, where I have conducted classroom ethnography on and off for 12 years. In 1988, I videotaped reading lessons in four first-grade classrooms in Villefleurie and its suburbs. Then I asked several groups of parents and teachers from the same locales to comment on these videotaped episodes.

When asked whether these episodes struck them as typical of elementary schooling as they remembered it, some parents protested, *"Oh, on ne s'en souvient pas de cela!* (Oh, we don't remember that!)" Even if they did remember, both parents and teachers claimed that elementary schools had changed drastically

since the 1950s and early 1960s when they were pupils. Therefore, they insisted, their memories were irrelevant. Implicitly contrasting present-day classrooms, they said that when they were children:

> *Les élèves écoutaient et ne parlaient que ceux qui étaitent invités à le faire.*
>
> Pupils listened and did not speak except for those invited to do so.
>
> *On n'avait pas le droit de questionner le maître.*
>
> We didn't have the right to question the teacher.
>
> *Il faillait avaler tout.*
>
> You had to swallow everything.
>
> *Il y avait de l'autorité!*
>
> There was authority!

Some teachers used the term *cours magistral* (literally, "magisterial course") to describe the old days, conjuring images of silent pupils dominated by a lecturing teacher.

An Ideal

In the context of these childhood memories, it was striking to hear these teachers and parents criticize the videotaped classroom episodes they had watched. Many of them said that the teacher on the videotape, Madame Monet,[2] was too "magisterial" and that her students were not "participating" enough. Thus they measured Madame Monet's class against an ideal of active

"participation" which differed sharply from the classrooms they claimed to have known as children.

What was going on here? And how might this incident help us understand the memories, ideals and other sources from which teachers draw when developing their personal practical knowledge for teaching[3]?

Background

France is an interesting setting for school ethnography because it is "so near and yet so far." French schooling is similar enough to American schooling that we may see direct implications for our own system. For instance, children enter first grade and begin formal reading instruction at the same age as in the U.S., and success at this stage affects later success in life just as much in France as in the U.S. Likewise, relations between parents and teachers in France reminds one of the U.S. (Anderson-Levitt 1989). On the other hand, French schools are different enough to "make the familiar strange." For example, "kindergarten" in France is really an institution distinct from the elementary school; it educates children for 3 years before first grade. Elementary school consists of grades one through five only. Of particular relevance here, French elementary school teachers receive fewer years of training than American teachers and, as we shall see, in the past some received no formal teacher education at all.

The research reported here was part of a larger study of teaching culture and national culture. In the larger study, I asked groups of teachers in France and in the United States to interpret and evaluate brief videotaped classroom episodes from both the U.S. and France, using research methods suggested by Spindler and Spindler (1987) and Ben-Peretz and Halkes (1987). In France, groups of parents were also invited to react to the same videotaped episodes. The assumption was that where teachers and their non-teaching compatriots reacted similarly, one could infer the influence of national culture on the teachers' thinking. Where teachers from different countries reacted similarly, one could infer the influence of a teaching culture which transcends national culture.

Influences on Teachers' Thinking

But let us be more specific about what might influence the thinking and practice of experienced teachers. Here I follow an outline proposed by Zeichner, Tabachnick and Densmore (1988):

(1) A future teacher's knowledge for teaching begins with life experience long before formal teacher training. Some of this life experience--one's "biography"--is unique to the individual, such as the previous careers that Stoddart will analyze in this session. Other life experiences are shared more or less with the entire population--notably, childhood memories of one's own schooling, the "apprenticeship" of "observation" (as discussed, for example, by Lortie, 1975).

As noted already, some of my informants questioned whether elementary teachers in France could draw on childhood memories in today's classrooms. Therefore, one of the questions to be addressed below is the degree to which elementary teaching really has changed in recent decades.

(2) Pre-service teacher education is explicitly intended to affect knowledge for teaching. If the explicit curriculum "don't get you," the hidden curriculum will (Zeichner et al., 1988). The field experience, that is, student teaching, also influences teachers-in-the-making, although exactly how depends on the setting, the master teachers, and the organization of the program (Zeichner, et al., 1988:27-28).

That, at least, is a plausible model for teacher socialization in the U. S. However, in France, roughly half of today's nursery and elementary teachers began teaching without any formal preparation (Lewis, 1985). Instead, because of the teacher shortage caused by the post-war baby boom, they were permitted to become auxiliary teachers immediately after graduating from academic high school. Some of these auxiliary teachers took brief courses to help them prepare for their certification exam, or have taken in-service workshops at some point after certification, but none of them has taken the equivalent of a full year of courses in pedagogy which they would have had in Normal School.

(3) Then there are multiple influences on the job. Zeichner and his colleagues note the socializing influence of the

pupils, "ecological" constraints such as teacher-pupil ratios and limited material resources, the subtle influence of colleagues, and the influence of administrators such as the principal or, in the case of France, the school inspector. In addition there are society-wide ideologies and practices, such as the de-skilling of labor or cultural stereotypes of women, which shape a teacher's experience on the job. (Zeichner, et al., list the last item under their fourth category, "cultural forms," but I put it here because it is specifically experienced in the workplace.)

(4) Finally, teachers may be influenced by "cultural forms," that is, the "forms of meanings and rationality that are dominant in a society." For example, an ideology of "liberal individualism" (Zeichner, et al., 1988: 30-31) probably affects teachers' policies toward cooperation and cheating. This article concerns what appears to be a "cultural form" in France, the ideal that children should participate actively in classroom learning. Although this ideal refers specifically to school setting, it may be linked to much broader cultural understandings ideals about self-expression and freedom in childhood (cf. Chombart de Lauwe 1971). Thus it is the sort of "cultural form" that could affect not only teachers on the job but also future teachers earlier in their lives.

What influences are under investigation here? *If* my informants were correct about the irrelevance of the childhood memories that they shared, teachers and parents alike, then similarities in thinking between the teachers and parents cannot

be attributed to shared memories, and must be attributed to "cultural forms," that is, ideas popular in France today. Meanwhile, given the fact that less than half of the teachers in this study received formal teacher training, differences in thinking between these particular teachers and parents are not readily attributable to formal training. Differences in their reactions more likely point to the influence of the teachers' on-the-job experience.

(In reference to my broader interests in national culture and transnational teaching culture, note that childhood memories of schooling are part of national culture, assuming that those childhood experiences were distinctly French. Likewise, "cultural forms" might be part of a distinctly French national culture; however, if the ideas promulgated in the popular press originated in, say, American psychology or German philosophies of education, then they represent something like "western" or perhaps "industrial" culture. Formal teacher training presumably transmits concepts unique to the profession; however, if these concept were influenced by pedagogical ideology in the United States, Germany and so on, then teacher education transmits a transnational teaching culture. Likewise, *to the extent that teaching conditions are similar* in France, the United States, Germany, and other nations, then the knowledge for teaching generated on-the-job will be similar and will form another component of a transnational teaching culture.)

Research Methods

Videotaping

The first step in this study, which was conducted from March through June, 1988, was to videotape a sample of reading lessons in French first-grade classrooms.[4] Drawing on knowledge accumulated during visits to nearly 40 classrooms in the Villefleurie area during this and previous fieldwork, and relying on the assistance of a local school inspector, I recruited four well respected, veteran teachers to participate. Amy Anderson and I observed each teacher's classroom for at least two days, and then videotaped continuous stretches of classroom activity over the course of two more consecutive days in each classroom.

It was extremely difficult to select sample episodes from this corpus of 8 hours from four classrooms. We were constrained by the anticipated limits of participants' time and attention in viewing sessions to select only two episodes of not much greater than 5 minutes' duration. We decided to choose both episodes from the same classroom so as to give viewers a better sense of the variation that exists over the course of the day even among the same teacher and children.

The problem, then, was to select the most "typical" of our four videotaped teachers. I ruled out Madame Nanterre because other teachers told me that she used an unusually "global" and unusually "difficult" method for teaching reading. I ruled out Madame David because her lessons emphasized silent reading more

than any others I had seen in France. I ruled out Madame Simon because, in her largely working-class school with its many pupils "in difficulty," too many parents had denied permission for their children to be viewed on videotape. That left Madame Monet, who had been a first-grade teacher for about 20 years at the same school. I chose her, then, because she seemed the most typical and also the most practical case, and also because she was not a teacher to whom the inspector had steered and me and thus did not represent his model of what French teaching ought to look like in its ideal form.

Like most French teachers, Madame Monet taught to the whole class rather than to small groups, and she used a mixed method of reading instruction. She had told me that, despite shifts in educational policy at the Ministry of Education level, "I keep doing the same thing and for a long time it was out of fashion but it's coming back again." Lest you misjudge this stability negatively in your own zeal for the "modern," bear in mind that at Rabelais School where Madame Monet taught, parents thought highly of her. Parents "in the know," particularly the many parents at this school who happened to be teachers themselves, arranged to have their children placed in Madame Monet's class rather than in one of the other two first grades.

Viewing Sessions and Viewers

Three viewing sessions were organized primarily for teachers and four primarily for parents, although most groups turned out

to be "mixed." After watching each episode, the viewers responded privately to an open-ended questionnaire before joining in group discussion of the event. The questionnaires were useful for eliciting minority views which might not have been expressed publicly, for example, in front of the director of one's school. The group discussions drew more elaborate analyses and also provided the opportunity to elicit comments from several parents (e.g., Moroccan immigrants) made uncomfortable by the questionnaire.

In the questionnaire, viewers were asked first to give their (non-evaluative) interpretation of each episode by "listing events." Secondly, they were asked to focus on the teacher's behaviors, first to describe--non-judgmentally, we hoped--what the teacher was doing, and then to evaluate those behaviors with the aid of a 5-point scale. Thirdly, they were asked to describe and then to evaluate the children's behaviors. The questionnaire had been piloted in the United States, then translated into French by Martine Mazurier and myself. Idiomatic expressions (e.g., "are you comfortable with") proved problematic, and we regret not having the time to do back translation. The appended French and English version are not perfect equivalents.

While 32 French teachers participated in the study, only 19 watched and answered questionnaires on the two French episodes. (Ethical considerations precluded showing the tapes of Madame Monet to her own colleagues, while limited time prevented viewing the French episodes at a second site.) Of these 19 teachers, 2

were senior high school professors and the other 17 had elementary school experience. In fact, the 19 teachers' on-the-job experience averaged 20 years and only one participant had taught less than 12 years. Less than half (only 7) of the teachers had received a Normal School education or any other formal training in pedagogy outside of brief in-service workshops.

Those parents who chose to participate in viewing sessions were a self-selected group--mothers and a few fathers who felt comfortable in the school. Viewing sessions were held for them at the four schools where taping had been done, and parents were enticed to participate by the prospect of watching non-research videotapes of their own children in class. Although 37 parents participated, only 25 viewed and evaluated the sample episodes from Madame Monet's class since we did not feel it was ethical to ask parents of her own students to do this. Any parents who listed their occupation on the questionnaire as "teacher" were counted as teachers rather than as parents. Of the remainder, about 20% listed professional positions (*cadres supérieurs et professions libérales*), about 25% had semi-professional positions (*professions intermédiaires, i.e., cadres moyens*), about 25% belonged to the lower middle class (*employés*), and less than 10% belonged to the working class (*ouvriers*). About 20% were homemakers. Thus the sample is heavily skewed toward whitecollar parents.

The Videotaped Episodes

I hesitate to describe the videotaped episodes because what viewers see and hear in them is exactly what is at issue here. However, let me provide you the context in which to interpret the appended transcripts. The first French episode, labeled "At the Board," is a 4-minute segment from a morning in early March. It begins with Madame Monet writing a text, in cursive, on the board. In the place of three words, she draws red rectangles--blanks to be filled in. Then she turns to the class and calls on Dorian, who reads the first few sentences aloud. The teachers corrects him occasionally, and when he comes to a blank, the teacher leads the class to discover that the missing words are *ficelle* (string), *fil* (cord), and *fils* (cords). The teacher then calls on Mathilde to read the remaining text. As the French teachers viewing this episode realized, in this lesson Madame Monet was introducing a text for the study of the /f/ sound.

The second French episode, "Books," is a 7-minute segment of a lesson which takes place at the end of the same morning. The children sit with individual reading books in front of them at their desks. They have already read a short text silently and out loud, and when the tape begins the teacher is calling on various children to read from a list of words beginning with the /f/ sound. She often stops the reading to interrogate the class on the meaning of a word. The class gets involved in a long and excited discussion when she tries to elicit from them the word

foc (meaning jib sail), a homophone for the word *phoque* (seal), which is in their books. Other French teachers described this as a reading and vocabulary lesson.

The participation structure of these episodes did not strike me as unusual for reading lessons in France. True, Madame Monet stood in one spot at the front of the room during the sample episodes--but I remembered seeing many lessons in many French classrooms taught from the chalkboard, which is a much used teaching tool in France. True, almost 70% of the talk during each episodes (measured by a rough count of lines in the transcript) was done by Madame Monet, but her teacher-centered method of interrogating the class did not strike me as different from what I had seen in other classrooms in France, whether the teacher stood in front, in back, or paced about. In any case, students were hardly silent. In the first episode, at least six different children got a turn at talk although the primary activity was reading the text aloud, which only two children did; in the second episode, children often gained the floor by calling out, and at points several children overlapped with the teacher. In the first episode, students took 14 of the 32 turns at talk and in the second episode 29 of the 62 turns.[5]

What Parents Said about These Episodes

"Participation" was one of many topics which arose in discussions among parents at the viewing sessions. Because we attracted parent participants by showing them videotapes of their

own children in class as well as our sample tapes from Madame Monet's class, we unwittingly set up a situation in which the parents volunteered comparisons between their own child's class and our sample French class. Their own child's teacher was always judged much more favorably, and in two of the three schools, the critical issue was "participation":

> *La première méthode était plus structurée et permettait à tous de participer, quelque soit leur caractère.*
>
> The first method [in my child's class] was more structured and permitted everyone to participate, whatever their personality.
>
> --This at "bourgeois" Balzac School.

> *La première impression que j'ai eu c'est que Madame Simon est plus sympathique,* (another parent jumps in) *--de les faire participer plus. Enfin le résultat était plus positif . . .*
>
> The first impression I had is that [our teacher] Madame Simon is nicer [than the teacher in the sample French episode], *(another parent jumps in)* --to have them participate more. Anyway the result was more positive . . .
>
> --This at largely working-class Emile Zola School.

On the questionnaire, which was filled out before group discussion took place, "participation" emerged as the most salient theme along with the related notions of "attention" and "interest." This was clear where the parents were asked to describe the children, of course. Of 10 parents who responded to this item about the first episode (see Table 1), 5 commented on "participation," usually negatively. For example, one wrote:

Ils ne participent pas vraiment.

They're not really participating.

The other frequent comments concerned interest--for example, "*peu intéressés* (little interested)," and attention, as in this assessment of the children:

De très attentifs à pas du tout intéressés.

From very attentive to not at all interested.

Comments on the second episode, in which the class discussed vocabulary items with the teacher, drew somewhat more positive comments about the same three themes, "participation," "attention" and "interest," although some parents still saw the children as *ennuyés*--bored.

Strikingly, even when we asked the parents simply to describe what was going on in the first episode--to list the events--they still wrote about "attention" and "participation" as well as about teaching methods or steps in the lesson. The most frequent responses to this question are listed in Table 2.

It is important to underline that while the parents tended to be negative, not all agreed in their assessment of how much the children were "participating" or "paying attention." For example, when "listing the events" for the first episode, one parent noted:

J'ai remarqué que tout le monde participe.

I noticed that everyone participates.

Yet another parent responded to the same question about the same episode with the comment:

Les enfants semblent tristes et participent peu.

The children seem sad and participate little.

For those who judged these episodes severely, the fault obviously lay with the teacher's method. For example, one parent added this comment to explain a favorable evaluation of the children's behavior during Episode 1:

La Méthode est ennuyeuse/les enfants s'ennuient: logique.

The Method is boring/the children are bored: logical.

Similar comments were written to describe the teacher (see Table 3). For example,

Non motivante, n'appelle pas l'enfant à l'écoute.

Not motivating, does not call the child to listen [or: to alertness].

Pas dynamique. Not dynamic.

Méthode peu vivante, peu de participation des enfants.

Not a very lively method, little participation by the children.

Some parents gave positive credit to the teacher's method for the second episode with its discussion of vocabulary:

Faire parler les enfants. Makes the children talk.

However, Madame Monet's method in this episode, too, drew criticism:

> *Ne fait pas assez participer chaque enfant.*
> Doesn't have each child participate enough.

Summary. The parents made clear that participation and attention were highly desirable behaviors. They linked participation with "liveliness" and probably with "getting the children to talk," while associating attention very strongly with "listening." They also associated the children's attention with their "interest" or "motivation." When children were bored or failed to participate, many parents blamed the teacher's methods.

What Teachers Said about These Episodes

None of the teacher groups used the word "participation" when discussing the episodes together, but they did use the concept on the questionnaires. And in discussion, they referred to the related them of "interest." For example, one teacher said the children in Episode I were "*ennuyés* (bored)," while other teachers commented that the American episodes they had watched were *plus vivants* (livelier) and the American children more *intéressés* (interested).

The teachers, like the parents, also talked about "paying attention," but in several cases it was not to criticize Madame Monet but rather to cast the children's irregular attentiveness as a natural phenomenon. As one nursery school teacher put it,

Ah, ça, c'est normal. Dans n'importe quelle classe quelques élèves font attention pendant que d'autres ne la font pas.

Ah, that's normal. In any class some pupils pay attention while others don't.

In the same vein, when a parent at another school began to criticize Madame Monet's class because the children were "not motivated," a teacher stepped in to argue, "*Ici on ne voit qu'un petit extrait* . . . (Here you see only a little excerpt . . .)." A parent-teacher in the group backed him up:

C'est pour ça que j'ai demandé à quel moment ça passait. Et il y a des moments plus spectaculaires pour le caméra.

That's why I asked [previously] at what moment of the day this [episode] took place. And there are [i.e., one could find] more spectacular moments for the cameras.

Teachers in another group provided another rationale for inattentiveness in terms of the times we live in:

(Maintenant) les enfants sont beaucoup plus turbulent, plus agités, moins attentifs.

(Nowadays) children are much more turbulent, more agitated, less attentive.

Her colleague elaborated:

Maintenant ily y a beaucoup de choses qui tirent leur attention; (ils sont sollicités): la télévision, et cétéra.

Nowadays there are many things which pull their attention; (they are "solicited"): television, radio, et cetera.

On the questionnaires, as Table 1 shows, teachers used some of the same labels as the parents to describe the children's behaviors. Like the parents, they noted a "*manque d'intérêt* (lack of interest)" in Episode 1, the lesson at the board, and noted that "*seuls quelques-uns participent* (only some participate)." The only difference is that proportionately fewer teachers than parents made these comments.

In contrast, when asked to "list events," the teachers wrote almost nothing about "participation," providing instead detailed descriptions of Madame Monet's teaching objectives and steps in the lesson (Table 2). (The few who did comment on participation did not agree any more than the parents about whether students were interested and participating or not.)

Nor did the teacher's description of Madame Monet's behavior (Table 3) refer to "participation" per se. Instead, regarding Episode 1, two teachers called her "*traditionnelle* (traditional)," one offering "*classique* (classic)" as a synonym. Another called her "*magistrale* (magisterial)," a word which calls up a very specific image from the "traditional" past, as we saw above. The words *traditionnelle* and also *classique* came up to describe her manner in Episode 2, as did the comment "*très directive* (very directive)."

Summary. Like the parents, the teachers implied that both participation and attention were very desirable behaviors. And, as we saw for the parents, there were hints that the teachers saw "participating" as an active behavior (related to "expressing

oneself") while they saw "paying attention" or "following" as a more passive form of engagement. Like the parents, the teachers valued "interest" and criticized "boredom," and--again like the parents--they attributed the children's supposed lack of "participation" to the teacher's method. The teachers described that method as "traditional" and "magisterial," using terms that associated it strongly with the past. However, in contrast to the parents, some teachers explained the waxing and waning of attention or interest as a natural phenomenon over the course of the day, or as an artifact of television and other demands on a child's attention in the modern world. Thus, while agreeing with parents that "participation" depends on what a teacher does, these teachers shifted the locus of "attention" and "interest" from the teacher's method to the children themselves.

Conclusion

The Ideal of Participation

Participation as a modern ideal. The major finding of this study is the remarkable agreement between teachers and their non-teaching peers on the value of "participation" and "attention" in the classroom. While the teachers praised participation rather quietly in the course of commenting on Madame Monet's objectives and the like, the parents in the study might as well have inscribed participation on the walls along with *liberté, égalité* and *fraternité*. Therefore, although some of the teachers might have heard "participation" discussed in Normal School or an in-

service workshop, the ideal is clearly what Zeichner and his colleagues mean by a "cultural form" which dominates the larger society.

Note that the parents and teachers unequivocally framed the ideal of participation as "modern." Not only was it different from their childhoods, but a teacher like Madame Monet who allegedly did not permit much participation was associated with the past. In fact, one could discern a more complex placement of classrooms along a continuum from the Past to the Future in various comments made by the teachers. While a few teachers called Madame Monet's classroom "magesterial," one teacher explained that here class wasn't really like the magesterial classes of the past; it just tended in that direction. Meanwhile, some of the teachers commented that their own classes were certainly noisier and wigglier (implying greater "participation," I take it) than Madame Monet's class. Moreover, when French teachers watched sample episodes from an American first grade, they said the American class was wigglier than their classes. The following continuum is suggested by their comments:

THE PAST <----------THE PRESENT----------> THE FUTURE

magesterial classes <-----Mme Monet's class------"my class"-----> American classes

A dominant ideal is not necessarily a universal ideal. Here it is important to recall that my informants were not ordinary

parents, no random sample of French citizens. These were overwhelmingly white-collar parents who felt comfortable coming to their child's school for an extracurricular viewing session. Middle-class and professional parents are the parents most likely to read the latest popular books on child development, to subscribe to journals like *Le Monde de l'éducation* that summarize the latest ideas, to study the Ministry of Education's Official Instructions, or to watch television discussions on such topics. Working-class parents are more likely to prefer--indeed, to insist on--traditional teaching methods (Anderson-Levitt, 1989; Twymon, forthcoming). There is an apparent equation here of higher status with modernity and of lower status with tradition which needs further sorting out (see Reed-Danahay and Anderson-Levitt 1988).

Have classrooms really changed since the 1950s? Logically, the shared passion for participation might have had roots in the childhood experiences which the teachers and parents shared. However, student's "participation" really did increase gradually after World War II, according to convincing interviews conducted by Guy Vincent (1980) with teachers whose careers spanned the 1930s to the 1970s. His informants recalled a time before the war when students hardly ever "expressed themselves" and teachers "did not want any noise" (1980:213). They also remembered making tentative experiments with "participation" after the war, whether it meant bringing a tape recorder to class or simply permitting one's first graders to come up with their own list of words

containing ba, pe, or whatever the week's syllables. The change was gradual and uneven, so that it is hardly surprising that my informants recalled stiff and quiet classrooms from the 1950s or even 1960s.

There was not, of course, a single change but rather a whole cluster of methods which different teachers might try out, from rearranging the students' desks to encouraging original compositions. One common change, notes Vincent, was to move the teacher's desk to the back of the room. If the changes were clustered, and if certain artifacts like the location of desks were taken to represent a whole approach to teaching (cf. Cuban 1984), this help explains my informants' reactions to Madame Monet's class. Although many of Madame Monet's students took a turn at talk and, in the second episode, gained the floor by calling out, Madame Monet remained stationary at the front or front corner of the room. Moreover, her desk was squarely planted on a "stage" in front of the blackboard. The French viewers may have been responding to this use of space while paying less attention to the class's actual participation structure; that is, the teacher fixed in the front of the room may have been the overriding symbol for them of a "traditional" classroom.

Actual Classroom Experience

Ideals are not the same thing as practice. However, Vincent makes a very important point about the changes he has traced.

They did not replace the older style of teaching he says, but rather came to coexist alongside it, and often in conflict with it. Instead of memorizing ideas proposed by the teacher, for example, students may be asked to come up with their own ideas; yet they are still evaluated on the basis of "right" answers. This can turn classroom discussions into riddle-like interrogations (Vincent 1980:229).

If Vincent is right--and most of his classroom observations ring true for this observer--then participation has been completely accepted as an ideal but imperfectly realized in the classroom. This explains how I came to videotape a classroom which seemed typical to me yet which violated parents and teachers' ideals of participation. Like the other teachers, Madame Monet believed in participation--and partially implemented it in her classroom. After all, the children had to join in a sort of discussion to fill in blanks in the episode at the board, and they "participated" excitedly to solve the riddle of difficulty vocabulary words in the second episode. But at the same time, Madame Monet controlled their turns at talk and reprimanded them for wandering from her subject. She stood in front of and above her first graders and raised her voice above their occasional clamor to demand order. As Vincent and my own classroom observations suggest, I would be able to document many similar "relic" of the 1950s in the classrooms of the teachers who criticized Madame Monet, despite their modern ideals.

A note on "attention" as opposed to "participation." Even in this study, teachers (and parents) mixed the old with the new. In contrast to the modern ideal of "participation," the ideals of "attention" and "interest" entered French schools a century ago. With the organization of obligatory, secular schooling in the 1880s came new teaching philosophies, informed by a century of revolutions on the part of a repressed population. A teacher should not coerce children to follow rules, but rather should lead children to understand the rules and thereby to cooperate with them willingly (Vincent 1980:96). The problem of motivating the children was addressed by putting the teacher at the center of the classroom. The teacher was instructed to develop the reason, imagination, conscience and above all the attention of the child, by making studying attractive, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, by remaining in one place and demanding that all eyes are on him (Vincent 1980:98; cf. Prost. 1967:114). Children were likewise to sit still and in silence--ideally as a result of self-mastery rather than the teacher's stick--the better to apply themselves to their work (Vincent 1980:100). Thus "attention" and "interest" are concepts deriving from the "traditional" teacher-centered classroom against which my informants reacted.

On-the-job experience tempers teachers' views. The subtle but real differences detected here between teachers' views and parents' views also point to the significance of what actually

goes on in the classroom. We have seen that even while the teachers valued attentiveness they offered rationales for the lack of perfect attention. They tended to describe "attentiveness" and "interest" as functions of the child rather than as functions of the teaching method. Since formal teacher training seemed to have almost no influence on these teachers' responses to the videotaped episode,[6] it is reasonable to conclude that they think differently from parents on this issue because of their 20 years of classroom experience.

A prior in-depth study of three teachers' perceptions of their pupils (Anderson-Levitt, 1983) helps explain the teachers' perspective. In the course of observing their first-grade classrooms during most of the 1978-79 school year, I periodically asked teachers Jeannette Durand, Marie Berger and Paul Alain to comment on each child in the classroom. "Paying attention" was an important theme for two of the teachers and "participation" for all three. But they did not discuss these themes for all students, but only for particular children. For example, Madame Berger worried about 7 of her 27 students who didn't "participate" or weren't "integrated" or simply weren't "there [in spirit]"; the same seven students ended up repeating first grade or moving into special education. Monsieur Alain was bothered by the few students who "wouldn't participate" in exercise and dance, and by the six students who didn't "pay attention" or "follow." Madame Durand commented on which children "paid attention" at the beginning of the year, and at

the end of the year she singled out 9 of her 23 students who were "participating more" or showing "good participation.".

What these teachers noticed, in other words, was the variation among students on the dimensions of attentiveness and participation. They worked with a class of twenty-some students, the majority of whom did seem to pay attention and participate; those children who "failed" to do so were the salient exceptions. Thus the situation focused their attention on the children rather than on themselves, and it was a natural logical leap for them to inattention or lack of participation"in" the child rather than "in" the teaching method. After all, the method worked (at least so it appeared) for everyone else.

Further Questions

This exploration of a "cultural form" and its relationship to rejected childhood memories raised many questions which go beyond the issue of teacher socialization. For example, why should student participation become an ideal at a particular point in time? The claim that French teachers were unhappy about their childhoods in traditional classrooms is no explanation of change, for several previous generations suffered the same alleged misery without pressing for change. Vincent (1980) points to several sources to the new ideal, including the development of a universal middle school in France in the 1960s which took pressure off elementary schools to pack a complete education into children's heads. However, more than the

particular history of France is in question. What was the relationship of "modern" French ideals to movements in other countries, including the progressive movement of the early 20th century in the United States (Cuban 1984) or to American child psychology (Vincent 1980)? Meanwhile, what are the various connotations of "modern" and "traditional," and why have some of my teacher-informants over the years hinted that American schooling is more modern or advanced than French schooling?

Another question raised by this cross-cultural symposium is the implication for Third World school systems influenced by "cultural forms" of schooling in countries like France and U. S. Does "participation" belong to a package of modern ideals exported to those school systems? If so, how is it translated into practice in such different settings?

Finally, to return to the question of sources of teaching culture, it has been suggested that the ideal of participation significantly affects teachers' talk about teaching but less surely affects what they do in the classroom. I also suspect that American teachers, who likewise see participation or "student involvement" as an ideal, translate the ideal into practice very differently than the French teachers. Thus the relationship of general ideas to specific classroom practices cries for further exploration here.

Notes

1. I gratefully acknowledge that the study reported here was made possible by a University of Michigan Rackham grant for Faculty Development, and by a research leave granted by the University of Michigan-Dearborn. The research would not have been possible without initial encouragement by Leon Levitt, research assistance from Amy Anderson, facilitation at every step by Martine Mazurier and an anonymous school inspector, and the gracious participation of the teachers who allowed us to videotape and the parents and teachers who participated in viewing sessions. Earlier fieldwork in Villefleurie was made possible by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Council for European Studies.

2. Proper names of informants, schools, and the city are pseudonyms.

3. "Personal practical knowledge," a phrase drawn from Clandinin and Connelly (1986), avoids for the moment the question of how much the teachers' knowledge is "cultural" in the sense of "shared" with other teachers or with other French citizens. Of course, even idiosyncratic ideas are part of "cultural" knowledge in the sense that they are learned within the context of a body of knowledge and feelings acquired as a member of society.

4. First-grade reading is the focus because of its particular importance to school success, and videotapes of that activity could be interpreted in the context of my prior research (Anderson-Levitt 1987).

5. Utterances in which Madame Monet gave a little lecture and then called on a student to recite were counted as two turns.

6. As noted, only 7 out of the 19 respondents received formal training. Moreover, there were almost no questionnaire items which the "trained" answered differently from the "untrained." In fact, the only difference between the two groups appears to be that teachers who had received formal training were more likely to respond to Question 3a, describing the teacher, although they were no more likely to offer evaluations of Madame Monet in Question 3b.

References

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M.

1983 French Schoolteachers' Model of the Six-Year-Old, paper presented in the symposium on Folk Theories of Childhood, annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Chicago.

1987 Cultural Knowledge for Teaching First Grade: An Example from France. *In* George D. Spindler and Louise Spindler, Eds. *Interpretive Ethnography at Home and Abroad.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

1989 Degrees of Distance between Teachers and Parents in Urban France. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 20(2):97-117.

Ben-Peretz, Miriam, and Rob Halkes

1987 How Teachers Know Their Classrooms: A Cross-cultural Study of Teachers' Understandings of Classroom Situations. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 18(1):17-32.

Chombart de Lauwe, Marie-José

1971 *Un monde autre: L'enfance de ses représentations à son mythe.* Paris: Payot.

Clandinin, D. Jean, and F. Michael Connelly

1986 Rhythms in Teaching: The Narrative Study of Teachers' Personal Practical Knowledge of Classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 2(4):377-387.

Cuban, Larry

1984 *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980.* New York: Longman.

Lewis, H. D.

1985 *The French Education System*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lortie, Dan

1975 *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Prost, Antoine

1968 *Histoire de l'enseignement en France, 1800-1967* (2nd ed.). Paris: Armand Colin.

Reed-Danahay, Deborah, and Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt

1989 Backward Countryside, Troubled City: French Teachers' Views of Rural and Working-Class Families. Ms. (Appeared later in *American Ethnologist* 18(3):546-564, 1991).

Spindler, George D., and Louise Spindler

1987 Cultural Dialogue and Schooling in Schoenhausen and Roseville: A Comparative Analysis. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 18(1):1-16.

Twymon, Sylvia

forthcoming *Early Reading and Writing Instruction in the Homes and School of Three Five-Year-Old Children from Working-Class Families*. Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor.

Vincent, Guy

1980 *L'école primaire en France. Étude sociologique*. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.

Wylie, Laurence

1974 *Village in the Vaucluse*, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Harvard.

Zeichner, Kenneth M., B. Robert Tabachnick, and Kathleen Densmore

1988 Individual, Institutional and Cultural Influences on the Development of Teachers' Craft Knowledge. *In* J. Calderhead, Ed. *Exploring Teachers' Thinking*, pp. 21-59. London: Cassell.

TABLE 1

Descriptions of the Children's Behavior

EPISODE 1 "AT THE BOARD"

French Parents (n=10)		*French Teachers (n=12)*	
+/- participation	5*	lack of interest	3
+/- attention	4	- participation	3
not interested	2	passive	2

EPISODE 2 "BOOKS

French Parents (n=9)		*French Teachers (n=10)*	
+/- participation	3	good	3
+/- attention	3	+/- attention	2
interested	3	+/- interested	2

*Number of informants who mentioned each item

TABLE 2

List of "Events" in This Episode

EPISODE 1 "AT THE BOARD"

French Parents (n=14)		*French Teachers (n=15)*	
+/- attention	5*	fill in/missing words	6
+/- participation	4	lesson on phoneme [f]	5
missing words	3	reading	4
teacher writes	2	+/- participation	4
reading	2	lesson on plural 's'	3

EPISODE 2 "BOOKS"

French Parents (n=17)		*French Teachers (n=16)*	
lesson on 'f' sound	4	lesson on phoneme [f]	8
+/- participation	3	explication of words	5
explication of words	2	reading	4
vocabulary	2	the word *farce*	3
		individual reading	2
		vocabulary	2
		the word *foc*	2

*Number of informants who mentioned each item

TABLE 3

Descriptions of the Teacher's Behaviors

EPISODE 1 "AT THE BOARD"

French Parents (n=12)		*French Teachers (n=11)*	
+/- motivation	3*	directive	3
not dynamic	2	traditional	2

EPISODE 2 "BOOKS"

French Parents (n=12)	*French Teachers (n=9)*	
(all miscellaneous responses, including "lively," "participative," "gets the children to talk," "doesn't permit the children to express themselves")	traditional	2
	(and miscellaneous remarks, e.g., "classic," "very directive," "gets [them] to discover")	

*Number of informants who mentioned each item

APPENDIX 1

Sample Page from Questionnaires

in French and in English

Veuillez répondre après avoir regardé la 1ère séquence: France au tableau

1. Que s'est-il passé? Faites une liste des événements que vous avez remarqués:

   •_____
   •_____
   •_____

2. En quelques mots, caractérisez la façon de faire de l'enseignante:

   •_____ •_____ •_____

   Êtes-vous d'accord avec sa façon de faire? (Entourer le numéro:)

   5 Tout à fait — 4 — 3 Assez — 2 — 1 Pas du tout

   (Facultatif) Préciser, expliquer:

3. En quelques mots, caractérisez la façon de réagir des enfants:

   •_____ •_____ •_____

   Leur façon de réagir, la trouvez-vous normale? (Entourer le numéro:)

   5 Tout à fait — 4 — 3 Assez — 2 — 1 Pas du tout

   (Facultatif) Préciser, expliquer:

4. Si vous vouliez faire d'autres commentaires, notez-les ci-dessous ou au verso.

France At the board

1. What happened in this episode? List events you noticed:

   1)
   2)
   .
   .
   .

2. How would you describe what the teacher was doing in 2 or 3 key words?

   _____ _____ _____

   Were you comfortable with or did you approve of what she was doing?
   (Circle the appropriate number.)

   Very much so <----------Neutral----------> Not at all

   1 2 3 4 5

   (Optional) Please explain:

3. How would you describe what the children were doing in 2 or 3 key words?

   _____ _____ _____

   Were you comfortable with or did you approve of what they were doing?
   (Circle the appropriate number.)

   Very much so <----------Neutral----------> Not at all

   1 2 3 4 5

   (Optional) Please explain:

4. (Optional) Further comments? Note them here or on the back.

Thank you!

APPENDIX 2

Transcripts of Videotaped Episodes

from the French Classroom:

"At the Board"

and

"Books"

AT THE BOARD
(France)

Teacher:	Who would like to begin? Dorian	Maîtresse:	Qui est-ce qui veut commencer? Dorian.
Dorian:	"Beatrice irons	Dorian:	"Béatrice repasse le
T:	The?(referring to the s on le)	M:	Le?
D:	her doll's dresses. Near her Patapouf plays with ..."	D:	les robes de sa poupée. Près d'elle Patapouf joue avec de la..."
T:	Fine. We will go through it now. It could be yarn, a piece of string. What else can it be?	M:	Bon. Alors, on va passer tout à l'heure. Ça pourrait être de la laine, de la ficelle. Qu'est-ce que ça pourrait être d'autre?
Class:	cord? cords?	La Classe:	des fils? du fil?
T:	We would not say "fil" with the article "la," with the definite article "de la." It may be a string, a cord, or some yarn. Maybe something else.	M:	On ne dirait pas "avec la fil," avec de la. Ça peut etre fil, ça peut etre ficelle, ça peut être de la laine. Peut-être autre chose.
Student:	A rope.	Élève:	Corde.
T:	It may be a bit heavy for a cat.	M:	Ça peut être un peu gros pour un chat.
Stu:	The thing where there are, where electricity goes through.	El:	Le truc où il y a, où l'électricité passe.

Teacher:	Yes. It may be.	Maîtresse:	Oui. Ça peut être.
Student:	(?) Says something or another.	Élève:	(?) Il dit quelque chose.
T:	Oh no. Fine. So then we will put string. Thus the word for number one is string. Who will continue? Mathilde.	M:	Ah non. Bon. Et puis on va mettre la ficelle. Donc numéro un: c'est le mot ficelle. Qui continue? Mathilde.
Mathilde:	"Beatrice looks at it and laughs, but there is the cat who pulls with his paws the..." (Mathilde is unsure of the word that is missing)	Mathilde:	"Béatrice le regarde et cela l'a fait rire mais voilà que le petit chat tire avec ses pattes le" (A ce moment Mathilde ne sait pas le mot qui manque).
T:	What? You go as far as the end to try to find the word (Mathilde reads to herself in order to find the word). Some... Well then, try to find the two words which are missing. What will go with to iron?	M:	Quoi? Tu vas jusqu'au bout pour essayer de le trouver (Mathilde lit tout bas pour qu'elle trouve le mot). Du...Alors essaies de trouver les deux mots qui manquent. Qu'est-ce qu'il va aller avec "à repasser?"
M:	Iron?	Mathilde:	Le fer?
T:	Iron (as in clothes iron). And next?	M:	Le fer. Et puis alors?
Student:	The?	Élève:	Le?
T:	The (pause) ... of the iron. The cord of the iron. The word is cord. What is the difference? Here we have (she points to the words).	M:	Le (hésitation) ...du fer à repasser. Le fil du fer à repasser. Donc c'est le mot fil. Mais quelle va être la différence? Ici on a (elle met le point sur les mots).

Class:	The string...the strings.	La Classe:	Le fil...les fils...
Teacher:	Who will tell me what is the difference. Michâèl.	Maîtresse:	Alors, j'écoute qui va me dire quel est la différence. Michâèl.
Michael:	If it is cord in the singular, it is "de" if there are two it is "des."	Michâèl:	Si c'est un fil, c'est "de", s'y en a deux, c'est des.
T:	So then, how do I spell cord the second time?	M:	Alors comment j'écris "fil" la deuxième fois?
Student:	With an "e"? With an "s"?	Eleve:	Avec un "eh"? Avec un "suh"?
T:	Oh. With an "s"! We put the same word but with an "s" because there are several (cords). Good. We have all the words. Who wants to read it again? Who will reread? Mathilde.	M:	Ooh. Avec un suh! On met le même mot mais avec un "suh" parce-qu'il ya plusieurs. Eh bien voilà on a tous les mots. Qui veut relire? Qui relit? Mathilde.
Mathilde:	With electric cords.	Mathilde:	Avec les fils électriques.
T:	Don't you see a line above which begins wiht "oh"?	M:	Tu ne vois pas une ligne dessus là qui commence par "ah"? Alors allez, "Ah".
M:	"Oh no! You should not play with electric cords," says Beatrice.	Mathilde:	"Ah non! dit Béatrice, il ne faut pas jouer avec les fils electriques."
T:	Good. It is worthwhile not only for the cat but for you. Why must you not play with electric **cords**?	M:	Bon. C'est valable pour vous bien-sûr, pas seulement pour le chat. Pourquoi il ne faut pas jouer avec les fils électriques?

Students:	Because_____.	Eleves:	Parce-que____.
T:	Because it is (pause)	M:	Alors, parce-que c'est (hésitation)
Stu:	Dangerous.	E:	Dangereux.
T:	Dangerous.	M:	Dangereux.

Teacher:	Good. Let's go on! For the second time, the other words. Sévrane.	Maîtresse:	Bon. Allez! La deuxième fois d'autres mots. Sévrane.
Sévrane:	Window. Error. Joke or stuffing.	Sévrane:	Une fenêtre. Une faute. Une farce.
T:	(Pointing to the word "farce") I would like it that you tell me (the meaning) because there are two different explanations.	M:	Alors, j'aimerais qu'on me dit, parce-que il y a deux explications.
Elvire:	A farce. A farce.	Elvire:	Une farce. Une farce.
T:	Elvire.	M:	Alors Elvire.
Elvire:	A "farce" is like a small recipe. And and then, and also then a "farce", a farce.	Elvire:	Une farce c'est comme une petite recette. Et puis, et puis aussi une farce, une farce.
T:	I am ~~...of a recipe~~ Follow the recipe idea. In cooking, what is stuffing?	M:	~~Je~~ Suis ~~l'idée~~ d'une recette. En cuisine qu'est-ce que c'est une farce?
Student:	It is like, it is like a vegetable.	Élève:	C'est comme, c'est comme un légume.
T:	Oh, it varies. But what do you do with stuffing when cooking? I said when cooking. We can stuff tomatoes.	M:	C'est très variable mais qu'est-ce qu'on fait avec une farce en cuisine? On a bien dit en cuisine. On peut farcir--des tomates.
Class:	(Volunteering vegetables)	La Classe:	(Propose quelques noms de legumes)
T:	Zucchini. Eggplants. We can even stuff meat. We can stuff a small chicken. This means that we put something inside.	M:	Des courgettes. Des aubergines. On peut farcir même de la viande. Ou on peut farcir une poulette. Ca veut dire qu'on met quelque chose a l'interieur.

Teacher:	It may be meat. It may be vegetables.	Maîtresse:	Ça peut être de la viande. Ça peut être des legumes.
Student:	Sometimes...	Élève:	Parfois...
T:	Good! The second meaning of "farce" which has nothing to do with cooking.	M:	Bon! Deuxième explication de la farce qui n'a rien avoir avec de la cuisine.
Class:	Something that...	La Classe:	Quelque chose qu'il...
T:	Fine. When one says or does something which is not real. Recall to me what was the joke that Yves played on Beatrice?	M:	Bon. Quand on dit ou on fait quelque chose qui n'est pas vraie. Rappelez-moi quell'était la farce qu'avait faite Yves a Béatrice?
Student:	(softly) He rang (the doorbell) and he hid.	Élève:	(doucement) Il avait sonné, et s'est caché.
T:	He had rung the doorbell and he hid to make believe that there was noone (at the door). He had rung...	M:	Il avait sonné à la porte et il s'était caché pour faire croire qu'il n'y avait personne. Il avait sonné un...
Student:	(Child utters something)	Élève:	(Dit quelque chose--on ne sait pas)
T:	It is not true, therefore it was a joke. Go on! Let's continue.	M:	Et puis ce n'est pas vrai, donc c'était une farce. Allez! On continue.
Student:	A...	Élève:	Un...
T:	Sh! (To the rest of the class) Stop wiggling like that.	M:	Sh! (Envers les autres) Arrêtes de remuer comme ça.
Student:	A "phare".	Élève:	Un phare.
T:	What is it? Sévrane.	M:	Qu'est-ce que c'est , Sévrane?

Sevrane:	A car's headlight.	Sévrane:	Un phare de voiture.
T:	A car's headlight. Or what else?	M:	Un phare de voiture. Ou bien?
Class:	A lighthouse on the seashore.	Classe:	Un phare au bord de la mer.
T:	A lighthouse on the seashore. In a way it is the same thing. A lighthouse which lights up. Eh? It produces light.	M:	Un phare au bord de la mer. Mais c'est la même chose en fait. Un phare à éclairer. Hein? Ça produit de la lumière.
Student:	One day...	Élève:	Un jour...
T:	Yeah. Next (word).	M:	Ouais. Ensuite.
Sevrane:	Pharmacy.	Sévrane:	Une pharmacie.
Student:	(_____)	Élève:	(_____)
T:	Yes, but we dont' have time to explain all the words. It is necessary to know them.	M:	Oui, mais on n'a pas le temps d'expliquer tous les mots. Il faut les connaitre.
Sevrane:	A...	Sévrane:	Une...
T:	Sevrane, the word is_____.	M:	Alors Sévrane, c'est le mot_____.
Sevrane:	Photo. Seal.	Sévrane:	Une photo. Un phoque.
T:	A seal. And what is a seal, Sevrane?	M:	Un phoque. Et qu'est-ce que c'est, Sévrane?
Sevrane:	A white animal.	Sévrane:	Un animal qui est blanc.
Class:	It's gray.	Classe:	C'est gris.

Teacher:	It'sgrey and where does it live?	Maîtresse:	C'est gris et ça habite où?
Class:	In the water.	Classe:	Dans l'eau.
T:	In the water.	M:	Dans l'eau.
Class:	!!!	Classe:	!!!
T:	It is. I want to go on. I didn't ask for a novel. Does anyone know some other word which is pronounced like "phoque" but written different. I will write it after. Think! There is something else which is called "foc". Dorian.	M:	Ça y est. Je veux continuer. J'ai pas demandé de faire tout un roman! Quelqu'un connait-il quelque chose d'autre qui s'appelle un "phoque" et ne s'écrit pas comme ça, que je vous l'écris après. Reflechissez! Il existe autre chose qui s'appelle un "foc". Dorian.
Dorian:	A boat.	Dorian:	Un bateau.
T:	It is not! So then, what is on the boat? It is not the boat which is called a sail. What is it? It is this (she draws a picture of the sail). What is this on a boat? First of all, what kind of a boat is it?	M:	Ah c'est pas! Alors, qu'est-ce que c'est dans le bateau. Ce n'est pas le bateau qui s'appelle le foc. Qu'est-ce que c'est? C'est ça effectivement. Qu'est-ce que c'est dans le bateau? Un bateau comment, d'abord.
Student:	A boat...	Eleve:	Un bateau...
T:	Not really.	M:	Pas forcément.
Student:	Small?	Eleve:	Petit?
T:	In order for it to have a sail, what kind of boat must it be?	M:	Pour qu'il ait un foc, il faut que ce soit un bateau...
Student:	(_____)	Eleve:	(_____)